DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 935 JC 840 405

AUTHOR Latcham, Jack
TITLE An American System of Staff Appraisal. Coombe Lodge Case Study. Information Bank Number 1017.
INSTITUTION Further Education Staff Coll., Blagdon (England).
PUB DATE Jun 75
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Community Colleges; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Dallas County Community College District TX; Richland College TX

ABSTRACT

Prepared for staff in the British further education system, this report describes and explains the formal staff assessment model used at Richland College, Texas. Introductory material describes the college, its student body, and its organization and structure. Next, the four components of the teacher evaluation system used in the Dallas Community College District are outlined. First, the use of student evaluations of teacher performance is discussed, with reference to the validity of the process, the involvement of external agencies, the uses made of student evaluations, and informal feedback channels. Second, the process of classroom visitation by the division chair is described. Third, the self-appraisal process, which takes place in preparation for a formal interview with the division chair, is explained. Fourth, the formal appraisal interview, which seeks to reconcile the self-assessment and the opinion of the division chair, is reviewed. The next section focuses on the evaluation of senior staff, including the division chair, deans, and other non-teaching administrators. A section describing staff reactions to the appraisal system is followed by a short analysis of the relationship between faculty evaluation and staff development in the District. The final section points to some differences between the American and British educational systems which should be considered before any attempt to introduce the appraisal system in Great Britain. Appendices present forms illustrating various aspects of the appraisal system. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Coombe Lodge
Case Study

Information
Bank Number 1017

ED246935

AN AMERICAN SYSTEM OF STAFF APPRAISAL

	Page
Foreword	1
Introduction	3
Constituents of Teacher Appraisal	4
Student Evaluation	4
Classroom Visitation	5
Self Appraisal	5
The Formal Interview	6
Evaluation of Senior Staff	6
Staff Reaction	7
Staff Development	8
Comments	8
Appendices 1 - 6	11 - 31

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Rawlings

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Jack Latcham
Staff Tutor

June 1975.

JC 840 405

FOREWORD

An earlier report - 'Some Aspects of Community Colleges in Texas' published in March 1974 in this volume of 'College Management' comprised a survey of several aspects of the Community Colleges in Dallas County. In response to a growing interest in staff appraisal this aspect was pursued in greater detail during a series of research visits in the Spring of 1975.

* * *

AN AMERICAN SYSTEM OF STAFF APPRAISAL

Introduction

1. In the United States, faculty evaluation (formal staff assessment) is fairly widely practised. The description which follows relates to one particular college whose system is widely based, other institutions make use of similar devices but may not employ them all.

2. The system described is that used at Richland College which is one of four in the rapidly expanding system in Dallas County. The Dallas County Community College District started in 1966 with one college, by the Autumn of 1972 four colleges were in operation and by the Autumn of 1978 seven colleges will be in service. It is estimated that by 1978 a total of about 60,000 will be served of whom about half will be 'credit' students following courses which in DES terms would be regarded as leading to 'recognised' qualifications. The remainder will follow 'community service' courses which in Britain would be classified as 'adult education', involving recreational and non-vocational classes.

3. Richland has been built on a 250 acre site on the Northern outskirts of the city of Dallas and draws the majority of its students from the very prosperous middle-class residential areas in the vicinity. Enrolment in the Spring of 1975 comprised about 9,000 students on community service courses and 8,970 on credit courses. The full-time equivalent of the credit course students was approximately 5,500. The total full-time academic staff was about 150 of whom 128 were full-time teachers and 250 part-time teachers were employed. It is significant that in the Spring of 1973 the full-time equivalent of credit students was 2,300. The FTE population had more than doubled in two years but with an increase in full-time staff of only about 10, although with a substantial increase in part-time staff. The college operates with a student staff ratio of 27:1, which is the norm for the Dallas system, it is operating at capacity and additional temporary buildings are to be erected before the start of the Autumn semester.

4. The senior academic staff of the college are called the 'Administration'. The equivalent of the British chief administrative officer is a Dean of Business Services. The main senior appointments are:-

President

Dean of Instruction

Associate Deans of Instruction

(a) Technical and Occupational Programs
(b) Extended Day Programs
(c) Community Development
(d) Staff Development

Assistant Dean of Instruction - Learning Resources

Dean of Student Services

Associate Dean of Student Services

Dean of Business Services

5. Teaching staffs are organised in eight divisions each corresponding to a discipline area. Each division is headed by a Division Chairman controlling some 15-20 full-time academic staff members. Chairmen teach one or two classes (3 or 6 hrs. per week). Below chairmen there are no gradings of teaching staff, teachers' pay is related to academic qualifications and length of service.

Constituents of Teacher Appraisal

6. The constituents of teacher evaluation are:-

(a) Student evaluation
(b) Classroom visitation
(c) Self Assessment
(d) Formal Appraisal Interview

Student Evaluation

7. Student evaluation of teacher performance has been in use in the United States over many years. The validity of the process has been widely challenged and extensively researched. The research results are not conclusive, the doubts about the validity of the process were frequently reflected in discussions with teachers but there was nevertheless a general acceptance that the student as the 'consumer' ought to be given the opportunity to express a view. Incidentally the average age of credit students was about 27.

8. A number of external agencies offer a teacher evaluation service which provides a questionnaire, conducts a computer analysis and provides print-outs. Such tests have been used in the Dallas system in the past but current practice is reflected in the Richland procedure where a joint committee of students and staff produce the questionnaire. This is revised annually and a good deal of discussion goes into the framing of the questions. Although the Dean of Instruction reserves the right of veto or modification he has never found it necessary to intervene. The Richland proforma is shown at Appendix A and comprises 25 questions of which 21 relate to the teacher's performance.

9. The evaluation is administered towards the end of the Autumn semester, two or three weeks before the final examinations. Students complete the questionnaire during a lecture period and transfer their markings to a sheet which can be computer marked. All teachers are evaluated including chairmen and part-time members of staff. The computer print-outs are issued during January, each full-time teacher receives five print-outs one for each of the five classes he takes to give a total teaching load of 15 hours/week. Copies are provided to the teacher, to his division chairman and to the Dean of Instruction.

10. Appendix D is a copy of one computer analysed report. The letter gradings and associated numberical gradings are those which are used in most American schools and colleges where a 'passing' grade is lettered A, B, C or D and scored 4, 3, 2, 1 respectively. F is a fail grade and is counted zero in scoring or averaging. The first four questions relate to the students; the class illustrated is a mix of first and second year students, full and part-time, they all expect to pass the course, their replies to question 3 shows that their overall progress to date tallies

fairly well with their predictions on question 2. Four of the 18 students take the course as an 'essential' module, 12 will get credit as an elective subject and two are taking it for interest only. The instructor will be well satisfied with this assessment, he will note that some of the students did not like the recommended texts (question 17) and will probably have some idea which three would not choose to come to his classes again.

11. The division chairman will also examine his copies of the reports and at Richland he would discuss with any instructor any outstanding or widespread dissatisfactions disclosed. This would not necessarily be the case at all the Dallas colleges, in at least one college, student evaluation is excluded from the final assessment of teacher performance and although it is carried out there it is used only as feedback to the instructor. There are, of course, other, informal, channels of feedback; students will talk directly with teachers about their presentation, with counsellors and in cases of difficulty will approach the appropriate division chairman.

Classroom Visitation

12. The college district regulations require a visit to the class to be undertaken as part of the appraisal sequence. Many division chairmen say that they in fact pay frequent visits to classes but in any event one visit is accorded a degree of formality late in the Autumn or early in the Spring semester. Each chairman needs to visit perhaps 15 full-time and 30 part-time teachers. He will invariably visit his full-time teachers himself but will elicit the help of his full-time teachers in visiting the part-time teachers. All formal visits are made with prior notice. District regulations require a visitation report to be completed and to be discussed and agreed by the teacher. Appendix 3 shows the class visitation summary which is completed at Richland. The detail is not regarded as very significant but evaluators use it to ensure that they consider all aspects of the lesson. The classifications are simple - 'Effective' 'Needs Improvement' and 'Unsatisfactory'. The narrative gives an overall view and makes specific suggestions. Copies of these reports, like summaries of student evaluations are kept by division chairmen, on the teacher's personal file.

13. At Richland the class visitation summary includes a comment on the use of instructional materials. At another of the Dallas colleges, Mountain View, a separate appraisal of instructional materials is used. The need for this has been recognised because of the rapid growth of individualised and self-pacing materials. In all the Dallas colleges and at Mountain View in particular there has been a move towards packaged instruction and some teachers rarely give a formal classroom lecture or lesson. The Mountain View- Instructional Materials and Procedures Appraisal has been designed for this situation, it calls for scrutiny not only of the suitability and quality of the materials but of the instructors use of them.

Self Appraisal

14. The culmination of the appraisal system is the formal interview conducted with the division chairman in early Spring. In preparation for this interview the teacher is invited to undertake a self appraisal. In order to do this he is invited to complete a Professional Appraisal Report (Appendix 4) which indicates to him the ground which will be covered in the interview. He may if he wishes draft his statement of objectives, achievements and aspirations in any other format which he prefers. The Professional Appraisal Report is directly related to the statement of teacher responsibilities printed on a teacher's contract.

The Formal Interview

15. Division Chairmen prepare for the appraisal interview by reviewing all the information available and complete a first draft of a professional appraisal report (Appendix 4). The conduct of the interview is determined by the personalities of those participating but the general intention is to seek some sort of reconciliation between the self-assessment and the opinion of the chairman. In the event the outcome of the meeting is a completed appraisal by the evaluator. The teacher is shown the appraisal report and signs as having discussed it with the chairman, if he wishes to dissent he may do so but not on the report, in the event he would probably defer any dissent until the next stage of the process.

16. The division chairman then discusses the appraisal report with the Dean of Instruction and then completes the Appraisal Report Summary (Appendix 5). This is signed by the chairman, the Dean and then by the individual teacher. The appraisal report summary is forwarded to the district office and three copies are disposed as indicated. The general contract pattern is of one year contracts during the first three years, under current practice teachers are then eligible to receive three year contracts renewable annually Special action has to be taken where re-employment is not recommended and before confirming or over-ruling such a recommendation the Vice-Chancellor of the district is guided by the comments of formal hearings first by a panel of teachers and then by an agreed arbitrator in which latter hearing both sides would be legally represented. It is generally regarded as very difficult to secure the dismissal of an unsatisfactory teacher through the formal mechanisms.

Evaluation of Senior Staff

17. Division Chairmen teach and so receive one or two personal student evaluations. In addition chairmen and other senior staff who do not teach are subject to a process in which they are evaluated by their subordinates. Appendix 6 illustrates the procedure for upward evaluation. There are two parts to an upward evaluation questionnaire, the first part is specific to the individual appointment and deals with qualities relating to discharge of the particular employment. In addition each reporter is asked to select, from 27 general questions, 15 which he considers most applicable.

18. The process of upward evaluation was first introduced in 1974 on a trial basis and 1975 was to have been the first year of full implementation. In the event response to the President's letter of 28th February was somewhat variable. The upward evaluation of deans and other non-teaching administrators were fairly prompt and complete but the response to the request to evaluate Division Chairmen was not responded to promptly or completely. Less than 60% of the full-time teachers evaluated their chairman. This may have been due in part to the shortness of the notice provided, the letter was dated 28th February and returns were required by 6th March, it may also have been due to some reluctance on the part of the teachers for a variety of reasons, some for example suggested that no useful purpose would be served by anonymous criticism of their chairman.

19. Each Division Chairman and each member of the administration is subject to a formal appraisal interview with his immediate superior and following the interview the evaluator produces a summary on the same form as is used for teaching staff (Appendix 5).

Staff Reaction

20. Staff appraisal systems were the subject of informal discussion with past and present members of college staff from several college systems. The arguments exposed during these discussions will be very familiar to British readers. The 'official' argument rested in the main on the question of accountability. It is argued that since the college system is supported by the electorate it is the duty of the administration to ensure that all aspects of the system are closely and continually scrutinised to ensure that funds are expended to maximum effect. The formal scrutiny of teacher performance is a most significant contribution to this scrutiny. It is argued that the system discloses weakness and strengths, encourages rectification of weakness and identifies candidates for promotion in an expanding system.

21. Most staff members accept than an evaluation system is necessary. At all levels there is recognition of the 'professional' problem namely the difficulty of one professional sitting in judgement on another. Several Division Chairmen used the word 'uncomfortable' in this connection. Nevertheless they all accepted the necessity for such judgements but spoke of a desire to establish a climate of mutual trust in which judgements were made fairly and openly. Several chairman and teachers had experience of systems in which there had been no reporting or confidential reporting and expressed a strong preference for the open system.

22. Teachers and administrators accepted the need for anonymity in student evaluation although some teachers felt vulnerable because of it. Although teacher representatives were involved in drafting the evaluation instrument some teachers were still critical of its content. Most frequently criticised were the questions relating to the teacher's knowledge of the subject, to his courtesy, confidence and enthusiasm and to his sensitivity to individual student needs.

23. As regards the use of class visitation as an evaluation instrument there was a widespread recognition of the dangers of reliance on an isolated and artificial situation. It seemed to be recognised however that no case for complaint against an unsatisfactory teacher could be supported without formal classroom visitation and the district administration insisted upon it. Again there was a strong view expressed by senior staff that the process was intended as supportive and not positive.

24. There was a great deal of ambivalence about the value of the upward evaluation of senior staff. At one extreme some teachers felt that it had been introduced as an inducement for the more ready acceptance of the top-down evaluation processes and could see no advantage. Teachers who had these feelings tended not to respond to the request to assess senior staff. Others feared that in spite of the procedural anonymity of the process they might be identified with adverse comment. Some senior staff claimed to have benefited from the process and to have modified their management style as a result. Some chairmen had been disturbed by anonymous adverse comments which they felt had arisen from misunderstandings which ought to have been explored more openly.

25. Teachers and senior staff all appreciated the theoretical advantages of a formal performance review interview. However some chairmen were uneasy about the conduct of the review and some teachers were dissatisfied with it. There was no provision for the training of senior staff in conducting the review and some felt it to be needed.

26. In the course of several discussions the question of peer-evaluation was raised. In one Californian community college system teacher evaluation is conducted by an elected panel of teachers. General feeling is that such a process is too cumbersome to be practicable. Some limited use of peer evaluation has been employed during the course of the Richland staff development programme where small teacher groups have worked in micro-teaching situations with closed circuit television and mutual criticism.

Staff Development

27. At Richland College staff assessment is a line management function and there is a separate staff development facility directed by an Associate Dean which provides assistance to individual teachers and groups with allied interests. In contrast Mountain View College links staff development closely with the assessment procedure, its equivalent to the Richland 'Professional Appraisal Report' has as well as the 'Effective', 'Needs Improvement' and 'Unsatisfactory' categories a fourth which is headed 'Professional Development Appropriate'.

Comments

28. The staff assessment system described provides an example which some senior staff might wish to see introduced into the British further education system. There are, however, several major points of difference which will bear examination.

29. First there is a well developed concept of accountability to the public, in this case represented by the local electorate. This derives from the method of establishing and maintaining the community college system which involves local consent through the ballot-box. Further, the direct election of members of the lay body which govern the colleges and their control of finance (which includes about 25% raised through local taxes specifically for the support of community colleges) leads to highly developed procedures of scrutiny. The concept is reflected in a management system which emphasises effectiveness and efficiency and is also reflected in an attitude among teachers who accept the reasonableness of staff evaluation although they may not agree on the methods employed.

30. Second it is significant that Texas teachers are not unionised to a significant extent. The four colleges have staff associations which elect representatives to negotiate with the district administration on matters relating to salary and conditions of service. Essentially however the climate is one of consultation as opposed to that of the participation which it has been sought to establish in this country. Although teachers are engaged on a contractual basis, initially on one-year contracts but subsequently on three-year contracts renewable annually, procedures have been negotiated to safeguard the position of a teacher under the threat of non-renewal of contract. In order to be able to terminate a contract the administration has to demonstrate that a teacher has failed to discharge his duties to an acceptable standard. This has involved teachers in acceptance of the concept of a reporting system and the administration to accept that the system should be open. Before terminating a contract it has to be demonstrated not only that a teacher has failed to discharge his duties satisfactorily but that he has failed to respond to a course of action specifically designed to overcome his shortcomings.

31. What the Dallas staff assessment procedures have established is a system which demonstrates all the stages which would have to be followed in this country to secure the dismissal of an ineffective teacher. These involve a precise definition of the weakness, formal communication to the teacher, agreement to a remedial programme and finally a demonstration of failure to respond to the agreed measures.

32. It is easy to over-emphasise this negative aspect of staff assessment and yet there remains the feeling that the administration has striven to set up procedures which allow an unsatisfactory teacher to be removed without offending a concept of natural justice. At the same time in presenting the system there is emphasis only on the positive aspects of helping the teacher in his professional development, of improving the learning environment for student and of securing for the system identitication of people who are likely to fill adequately the new senior posts which are being developed as this community college system expands.

33. Again, the administration in the Dallas system operates in a favourable market situation. There is an abundance of well qualified and experienced people who seek an opportunity to join the full-time staff of the colleges. Overall there is much greater job mobility and it is not unusual for people to move in and out of teaching. Under these conditions teachers are more likely to accept an appraisal system of the type described.

34. Student evaluation of lecturers has not been formally established in this country. In the Dallas community colleges students are on average older than their counterparts in further education in this country. Moreover most of them pay their fees themselves and there is a recognition to their right of comment as consumers and there is a long history of student evaluation in the American college system. Classroom visitation is accepted by the American college teachers with much the same reservations as are accepted in this country. The formal appraisal review is conducted in this country in very few colleges and where it is carried out there is great sensitivity as to the keeping of records and the purposes for which they are applied.

35. The most unusual feature of the Dallas system is the upward evaluation of senior staff. It is difficult to escape the feeling that its adoption has been a logical parallel to student evaluation and an inducement to teachers more readily to accept the overall processes. Upward evaluation might well serve a similar function in securing acceptance of any comprehensive system in this country.

36. In summary, the staff assessment system described stems from a concept of accountability which exists with a locally based system of direct finance and strong central direction. It is difficult to forsee the conditions under which a similarly comprehensive evaluation might develop in this country.

* * * *

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 — Instructor Evaluation: Richland College
Student Opinionnaire

Appendix 2 — Faculty Report Card
- Copy of a computer print-out in relation to one class

Appendix 3 — Richland College - Class Visitation Summary

Appendix 4 — Professional Appraisal Report

Used for:

a. Self Assessment

b. Annual Appraisal Interview

Appendix 5 — Contractual Employees - Appraisal Report Summary

Returned annually to district office in respect of each contracted teacher and academic administrator

Appendix 6 — Upward Evaluation

6 (i) Covering letter and upward reporting schedule

6 (ii) a. Upward Evaluation Questionnaire Division Chairman (Specific)

b. Upward Evaluation Questionnaire (General)

6 (iii) Upward Evaluation Questionnaire Dean of Instruction (Specific)
General questionnaire also completed (6b.)

6 (iv) Upward Evaluation Questionnaire President(Specific)
General questionnaire also completed (6b.)

• • • • •

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 1

Instructor Evaluation: Richland College
STUDENT OPINIONNAIRE

Instructor Code

This opinionnaire has been designed to allow you to anonymously evaluate your instructor. The results will become a part of the instructor's annual evaluation.

Assign a "grade" on each item by circling the appropriate letter. Transfer your letter grades to the IBM answer sheet which is precoded with the instructor's number and your section. If the question is inappropriate or you have no opinion, do not answer the question.

1. My classification is: (A) Full-time freshman (B) Part-time freshman (C) Full-time sophomore (D) Part-time sophomore (F) other . . . . . A B C D F
2. My final grade in this course probably will be: (A) A (B) B (C) C (D) D (F) F . . . . . A B C D F
3. My grade point average is approximately: (A) 3.6-4.0 (B) 3.0-3.5 (C) 2.5-2.9 (D) 2.0-2.4 (F) 1.9 or less . . . . . A B C D F
4. This course is: (A) required (B) elective (C) self-improvement only . . . . . A B C D F
5. The instructor knows the subject well. . . . . A B C D F
6. The instructor makes the objective of the course clear. . . . . A B C D F
7. The instructor's grading system is clearly defined. . . . . A B C D F
8. The instructor is fair in his evaluation of student's performance in this course. . . . . A B C D F
9. The instructor keeps students informed as to how they are doing in class. . . . . A B C D F
10. The instructor shows a willingness to give individual help. . . . . A B C D F
11. The instructor's attitude creates an atmosphere in which the students can ask questions, disagree and express their ideas. . . . . A B C D F
12. The instructor is courteous and considerate. . . . . A B C D F
13. The instructor has confidence and self-reliance. . . . . A B C D F
14. The instructor is enthusiastic about his subject. . . . . A B C D F
15. The instructor listens to student opinion regarding format and approaches to the subject matter. . . . . A B C D F
16. The instructor is aware of the feelings and needs of students. . . . . A B C D F
17. Textbook or assigned materials are appropriate to course level and subject matter. . . . . A B C D F
18. Considering the nature of the subject matter, the instructor presents material in an interesting manner. . . . . A B C D F
19. The instructor is prepared for each class session. . . . . A B C D F
20. The instructor paces content and assignments effectively. . . . . A B C D F
21. The instructor comments informatively on tests and assignments. . . . . A B C D F
22. The instructor is reasonably prompt in returning tests and assignments. . . . . A B C D F
23. The instructor emphasizes contemporary relevance of the subject matter. . . . . A B C D F
24. I would choose the instructor for another class if I were to take another course in this subject. . . . . A B C D F
25. I would give the instructor a final grade of: . . . . . A B C D F

YOUR CANDID COMMENT REGARDING EITHER THE COURSE OR THE INSTRUCTOR IS ENCOURAGED. USE THE BACK OF THIS SHEET.

When you are finished, place the instructor code (from the answer sheet) in the box above and return this sheet with your answer sheet. This sheet will not be released to the instructor until semester grades are processed.

APPENDIX 2

DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
RICHLAND COLLEGE

FACULTY REPORT CARD
JAN 09 1975

INSTRUCTOR CODE 443

SUMMARY OF ALL SECTIONS

QUESTION	NUMBER OF RATERS	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION A	B	C	D	F	GPA
1	18	5	4	3	3	3	2.27
2	18	6	3	8	1	0	2.77
3	18	5	6	6	1	0	2.83
4	18	4	12	2	0	0	3.14
5	18	16	0	2	0	0	3.77
6	18	6	6	3	1	0	3.16
7	18	9	6	1	1	1	3.16
8	18	10	4	2	1	1	3.16
9	18	12	2	2	2	0	3.33
10	18	13	2	2	1	0	3.50
11	18	15	2	1	0	0	3.77
12	18	18	0	0	0	0	4.00
13	18	16	2	0	0	0	3.88
14	18	16	0	1	0	1	3.66
15	18	16	1	0	0	1	3.72
16	18	12	3	2	0	1	3.38
17	18	10	2	2	1	3	2.83
18	18	11	2	2	2	1	3.11
19	18	15	0	2	1	0	3.61
20	18	13	3	2	0	0	3.61
21	18	12	4	0	2	0	3.44
22	18	16	2	0	0	0	3.88
23	18	9	7	0	1	1	3.22
24	18	11	2	2	0	3	3.00
25	18	9	5	3	1	0	3.22

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RICHLAND COLLEGE
CLASS
VISITATION SUMMARY

APPENDIX J

INSTRUCTOR _____ EVALUATOR _____

DATE _____ TIME _____ CLASS _____ TIME _____

METHOD OF PRESENTATION:

Lecture _____.
Discussion _____.
Laboratory _____.
Other _____.

REVIEW AREAS	Effective	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
1. Presentation:			
introduction			
verification of student attendance			
clarity			
effectiveness			
relation to objectives & goals			
completeness			
summary			
2. Instructional Materials:			
readiness			
appropriateness			
effectiveness			
3. Students:			
advanced preparation			
interest			
apparent understanding			
4. Instructor			
emotional climate			
enthusiasm			
responsiveness to students			
motivational efforts			
5. Facilities:			
arrangement			
accessibility to equipment			
safety			
6. Other			
_____			
_____			

Use reverse for narrative comments

1. Overall analysis of learning situation.

2. Specific recommendations:

3. Instructors comments.

4. Instructor signature_____ Date_____

Evaluator signature_____ Date_____

APPENDIX 4

PROFESSIONAL APPRAISAL REPORT

RICHLAND COLLEGE

(Instructor)

Name (Last, First, Middle) College Division Subject Field (s)

RESPONSIBILITIES

	Unsatisfactory	Requires Improvement	Effective
1. Understands and supports the philosophy and mission of the comprehensive community college	☐	☐	☐
Comment if appropriate.			
2. Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter being taught.	☐	☐	☐
Comment if appropriate.			
3. Understands the instructional process.	☐	☐	☐
Comment if appropriate.			
4. Uses his knowledge in an effective manner.	☐	☐	☐
Comment if appropriate.			
5. Plans instructional activities appropriate to the learning situation.	☐	☐	☐
Comment if appropriate.			

(OVER)

	Unsatis-factory	Improve-ment	Effective
6. Provides for individual differences in the classroom.	☐	☐	☐
Comment if appropriate.			

7. Stimulates student's learning activities. ☐ ☐ ☐

Comment if appropriate.

8. Judges student performance satisfactorily. ☐ ☐ ☐

Comment if appropriate.

9. Shows professional growth and development. ☐ ☐ ☐

Comment if appropriate.

10. Displays desirable personal characteristics. ☐ ☐ ☐

Comment if appropriate.

Suggestions for improvement or planned professional growth activities:

Instructor signature _____ Date _____

(Indicates document has been reviewed with chairman.)

Chairman signature _____ Date 17

APPENDIX 5

Dallas County Community College District

CONTRACTUAL EMPLOYEES
APPRAISAL REPORT SUMMARY

_____ Job Title _____ Year Employed _____
(last) (first) (middle)

Present Class/Step _____ Division _____ College _____

Present Contract Status:
Multi-Year Contract in Effect: ☐ One Year Contract in Effect ☐ One of Three ☐ Two of Three ☐ Three of Three

GENERAL APPRAISAL

Strengths:

Improvement is needed in the following areas (include suggestions for improvements):

Comments and suggestions

****

SPECIFIC APPRAISAL: ☐ Unsatisfactory ☐ Requires Improvement ☐ Effective

Based on the above appraisal it is recommended that:

_____ Current multi-year contract remain in effect.
_____ Three year contract be offered.
_____ One year contract be offered.
_____ Contract not be renewed (in cases where non-reemployment is recommended, copies of all campus evaluation forms, conference summaries, and appraisals must accompany this report.

This appraisal has been based on the following evaluations:
☐ Chmn/Administrator ☐ Dean ☐ Student ☐ Self

****

I have read the above appraisal report summary:

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Appraiser Title Date Signature Date

_____ _____ _____ _____
Dean Date President Date

Routing: Original - Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs- 1st Copy - President, 2nd Copy - Instructor, 3rd Copy - Appraiser

Form: DP5-009-73r

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 6(i)

RICHLAND COLLEGE
of the
DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

February 28, 1975

TO: Faculty, Division Chairmen, Directors, Administrators

FROM: President

SUBJECT: Completion of Upward Evaluation Questionnaire

The attached questionnaires have been developed by a committee of three faculty members and two administrators, following consultation with all those who are to be evaluated.

The first page refers with some specificity to the unique responsibilities a person has by virtue of occupying a particular position; the second page is more general and is designed to permit you to select the items which are most appropriate for the person you are evaluating. We believe that by combining these approaches we will increase the validity of the evaluations. Please complete both pages for each person you evaluate. You may recall that participation in last year's upward evaluation was completely voluntary and conducted for the purpose of collecting information for use by the division chairman administrator in self-evaluation. Hopefully, this year's evaluation will also be used for self-evaluation and improvement. However, the results will also be used by supervisors as one part of the total evaluation of their subordinates.

Accordingly, I want to request that everybody evaluate at the very least his or her immediate supervisor. If you are a faculty member, for example, you should evaluate your division chairman. In addition, please feel free to evaluate any and/or all other administrators. Your division secretary will have questionnaires which pertain to all positions other than that of your immediate supervisor.

Specifically, I request that the following be evaluated by those indicated.

Person to be Evaluated	Evaluator
Division Chairman	Division Faculty
Director, Financial Aid/ Placement	Technical/Occupational Instructor (Gus Herring) Assistant Director, Financial Aid/ Placement Dean of Student Services All Others (OPTIONAL)
Registrar/Director of Admissions	Counselors Division Chairmen All Others (OPTIONAL)
Assistant Dean, LRC	LRC Faculty All Others (OPTIONAL)
Associate Dean, Community Development	Community Service Associates Division Chairmen Administrative Council All Others (OPTIONAL)
Associate Dean, Technical/ Occupational	Technical/Occupational Faculty Division Chairmen All Others (OPTIONAL)
Associate Dean, Extended Day	Division Chairmen Community Service Associates Associate Dean, Community Development All Others (OPTIONAL)
Associate Dean, Student Services	Counselors Director, HRDC Registrar Dean of Student Services Dean of Instruction President All Others (OPTIONAL)

Person to be Evaluated	Evaluator
Administrative Assistant	Directors Division Chairmen Associate and Assistant Deans All Others (OPTIONAL)
Dean of Business Services	Directors Division Chairmen Administrative Council All Others (OPTIONAL)
Dean of Student Services	Counselors Directors Administrative Assistant Associate and Assistant Deans All Others (OPTIONAL)
Dean of Instruction	Division Chairmen Associate and Assistant Deans All Others (OPTIONAL)
President	Directors Division Chairmen Administrative Council All Others (OPTIONAL)

Recognizing and respecting the need of those individuals who wish to remain anonymous, the committee has recommended that you be given the option of identifying yourself as the evaluator. I agree with this recommendation.

Completed questionnaires should be forwarded to Rodger Pool, (H 268), by not later than 5:00 p.m., Thursday, March 6, 1975. If you have questions concerning the procedures outlined herein, please contact Rodger Pool, (746-4498).

Thanks very much for your attention to this matter.

jl

APPENDIX 6(ii)

UPWARD EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

DIVISION CHAIRMAN

(4) Outstanding
(3) Satisfactory
(2) Needs Improvement
(1) Unsatisfactory
(0) No Opinion

1. Effectively coordinates, develops, and revises all course offerings.	4	3	2	1	0
2. Effectively assigns instructors, rooms, and times to course offerings.	4	3	2	1	0
3. Effectively supervises support services of divisional office in order to facilitate instructional needs.	4	3	2	1	0
4. Effectively supervises daily instructional program.	4	3	2	1	0
5. Uses the faculty evaluation procedure as an effective means of encouraging personal and professional growth.	4	3	2	1	0
6. Encourages professional growth of division faculty and assists in implementation of professional development programs.	4	3	2	1	0
7. Is scrupulously fair in all dealings with faculty.	4	3	2	1	0
8. Provides responsive and open atmosphere in which faculty members feel free to discuss problems.	4	3	2	1	0
9. Accurately interprets and expresses faculty concerns to the administration.	4	3	2	1	0
10. Accurately interprets and expresses administrator's reactions to faculty concerns.	4	3	2	1	0
11. Shows willingness to accept consequences of innovative leadership efforts.	4	3	2	1	0
12. Is aware of affirmative action guidelines and ensures that recruitment and employment efforts are in compliance with such guidelines.	4	3	2	1	0
13. Demonstrates a mastery of the subject matter in his teaching area.	4	3	2	1	0
14. My overall evaluation of this person is	4	3	2	1	0

COMMENTS:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UPWARD EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL

From the following list, please select the fifteen (15) items you consider most appropriate for evaluating this administrator/division chairman.

(4) Outstanding
(3) Satisfactory
(2) Needs Improvement
(1) Unsatisfactory
(0) No Opinion

1. Organizes his area of responsibility to insure maximum service and support for the instructional/student services program.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
2. Provides evidence that he has the physical and mental health to handle the demands of his position.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
3. Indicates a sensitivity to the feelings of individuals.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
4. Works effectively with individuals who have varied backgrounds, interests, and aspirations.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
5. Is approachable in times of need.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
6. Stimulates staff members to strive for excellence in the performance of their tasks.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
7. Interprets and implements administrative policies and procedures in a consistent, equitable manner.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
8. Recognizes and acknowledges staff contributions and accomplishments.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
9. Encourages professional growth and development.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
10. Determines and articulates his point of view.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
11. Maintains effective communications with officers and staff members who are affected by his decisions.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
12. Delegates authority which is commensurate with responsibility.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
13. Encourages and supports staff members in his area in initiating innovative or experimental activities which are designed to improve administrative or educational practices.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
14. Continuously apprises staff members under his supervision of new regulations that affect the operation.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
15. Explains and clarifies administrative actions and attitudes affecting staff.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
16. Makes timely and effective decisions.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
17. Is open to suggestions and constructive criticism which are intended to improve his effectiveness.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
18. Observes ethical principles in conducting his work.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
19. Acknowledges successes, satisfactions and achievements of fellow employees and students.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
20. Respects confidential nature of conversations with fellow employees, students, and administrators.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
21. Demonstrates a sense of humor.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
22. Identifies reasonable and attainable objectives for his area of operation.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
23. Makes reasonable demands on persons reporting to him.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
24. Resolves problems within his area of responsibility.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
25. Demonstrates an adequate degree of personal adjustment (flexibility) to accept open discussion of professional differences.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
26. Recognizes and accepts the difference between personal and professional differences of opinion.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
27. Responds immediately to staff requests with appropriate information.	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)

APPENDIX 6(iii)

UPWARD EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

DEAN OF INSTRUCTION

(4) Outstanding
(3) Satisfactory
(2) Needs Improvement
(1) Unsatisfactory
(0) No Opinion

1. Provides administrative leadership by example rather than by fiat.	4	3	2	1	0
2. Effectively coordinates all aspects of the instructional program.	4	3	2	1	0
3. Supports and effectively coordinates district programs conducted on the Richland campus (TV instruction, cooperative education, etc.)	4	3	2	1	0
4. Is open-minded concerning change and innovation.	4	3	2	1	0
5. Is decisive, yet flexible, when called upon to render a decision.	4	3	2	1	0
6. Maintains quality of the overall instructional program.	4	3	2	1	0
7. Is totally professional in his approach to the supervision of faculty and administrative colleagues.	4	3	2	1	0
8. Is active in his support of curricular revision when appropriate.	4	3	2	1	0
9. Maintains moral qualities conducive to successful public service.	4	3	2	1	0
10. Is aware of affirmative action guidelines and ensures that recruitment and employment efforts are in compliance with such guidelines.	4	3	2	1	0
11. Demonstrates an understanding and support for the philosophy and mission of the comprehensive community college.	4	3	2	1	0
12. Demonstrates personal qualities that enhance his role as an administrator.	4	3	2	1	0
13. Provides evidence of ability to work effectively with other administrators, instructional personnel, and classified employees.	4	3	2	1	0

14. Demonstrates the ability to handle operational matters within the framework of the administrative organization.	4	3	2	1	0
15. Demonstrates ability to plan and implement his work.	4	3	2	1	0
16. My overall evaluation of this person is	4	3	2	1	0

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX 6(iv)

UPWARD EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PRESIDENT

(4) Outstanding
(3) Satisfactory
(2) Needs Improvement
(1) Unsatisfactory
(0) No Opinion

1. Handles administrative responsibilities smoothly and efficiently.	4	3	2	1	0
2. Attempts to maintain a high level of faculty and staff morale.	4	3	2	1	0
3. Facilitates the handling of personnel problems to insure fairness, integrity, and dispatch.	4	3	2	1	0
4. Anticipates problems far ahead of those problems becoming critical.	4	3	2	1	0
5. Shows participation and cooperation with the District's other colleges and offices.	4	3	2	1	0
6. Evidences knowledge of total campus budget maintenance.	4	3	2	1	0
7. Attempts to maintain high standards in the physical appearance of campus buildings and grounds.	4	3	2	1	0
8. Shows leadership and cooperation in the development of instructional and student services projects in an effort to improve the total educational program.	4	3	2	1	0
9. Is accessible for consultation consistent with official duties.	4	3	2	1	0
10. Provides an organizational atmosphere that encourages recommendations and decision making at the appropriate levels.	4	3	2	1	0
11. Is aware of affirmative action guidelines and ensures that recruitment and employment efforts are in compliance with such guidelines.	4	3	2	1	0
12. My overall evaluation of this person is	4	3	2	1	0

COMMENTS:

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

AUG 31 1984